

An AdS/QCD model from Sen's tachyon action

Ioannis Iatrakis^a, Elias Kiritsis^{a*}, Ángel Paredes^b

^a *Crete Center for Theoretical Physics, Department of Physics, University of Crete, 71003 Heraklion, Greece*

^b *Departament de Física Fonamental and ICCUB Institut de Ciències del Cosmos, Universitat de Barcelona, Martí i Franquès, 1, E-08028, Barcelona, Spain.*

ABSTRACT: We construct a new, simple phenomenological model along the lines of AdS/QCD. The essential new ingredient is the brane-antibrane effective action including the open string tachyon proposed by Sen. Chiral symmetry breaking happens because of tachyon dynamics. We fit a large number of low-spin meson masses at the 10%-15% level. The only free parameters involved in the fits correspond to the overall QCD-scale and the quark masses. Several aspects of previous models are qualitatively improved.

KEYWORDS: Gauge-gravity correspondence, Tachyon Condensation, QCD, Spontaneous Symmetry Breaking.

*On leave of absence from APC, Université Paris 7, (UMR du CNRS 7164).

Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. The model	1
3. Fitting the meson spectrum	4
4. Conclusions	7

1. Introduction

Understanding the strong dynamics underlying many observations related to the strong interaction remains an unsolved problem. Much progress has been made to date with different methods but new insights are always welcome. A recent development that has led to reconsidering the strong interaction has been the AdS/CFT duality. This has been applied to obtain new insights on QCD phenomenology. In this paper, we focus on the meson spectrum - (see [1] for a review of the gauge-gravity literature on the issue).

There are two main ways to address the problem at hand. Top-down approaches use string theory from first principles in order to build dual theories as close as possible to QCD. Notable examples are [2], [3]. On the other hand, bottom-up approaches, starting from the works [4, 5, 6], use known QCD features to develop holographic models that are only inspired by string theory. The model we present here is more of the second kind, but includes the main stringy ingredients we expect from first principles, namely the effective action controlling the chiral dynamics. Our main observation is that merging this stringy input of top-down holographic models for flavor allows us to improve the existing bottom-up models both qualitatively and quantitatively.

2. The model

Background and action

In [7], it was shown, quite generally, that effective actions for brane-antibrane systems derived from string theory [8] encode a set of qualitative features related to chiral symmetry breaking and QCD at strong coupling. The goal of this paper is to build a concrete model within the framework of [7]. We will consider the simplest smooth gravitational background that is asymptotically AdS, while having a confining IR in the same spirit as [9]. This turns out to be the AdS_6 soliton, which was shown to be a solution to the two-derivative

approximation of subcritical string theory and used as a toy model for certain aspects of 4d Yang-Mills in [10]. The metric reads:

$$ds_6^2 = \frac{R^2}{z^2} [dx_{1,3}^2 + f_\Lambda^{-1} dz^2 + f_\Lambda d\eta^2] \quad (2.1)$$

with $f_\Lambda = 1 - \frac{z^5}{z_\Lambda^5}$. The coordinate η is periodically identified and $z \in [0, z_\Lambda]$. The dilaton is constant and we do not write the RR-forms since they do not play any role in the following. We now consider a D4- $\bar{D}4$ pair, located at fixed η in this background¹. We write the action proposed by Sen [8] as

$$S = - \int d^4x dz V(|T|) \left(\sqrt{-\det \mathbf{A}_L} + \sqrt{-\det \mathbf{A}_R} \right) \quad (2.2)$$

The objects inside the square roots are defined as:

$$\mathbf{A}_{MN}^{(i)} = g_{MN} + \pi\alpha' \left[2F_{MN}^{(i)} + ((D_M T)^*(D_N T) + (M \leftrightarrow N)) \right] \quad (2.3)$$

where $M, N = 1, \dots, 5$, the field strengths $F_{MN}^{(i)} = \partial_M A_N^{(i)} - \partial_N A_M^{(i)}$ and the covariant derivative of the tachyon is $D_M T = (\partial_M + iA_M^L - iA_M^R)T$. The active fields in (2.2), (2.3) are two 5-d gauge fields and a complex scalar $T = \tau e^{i\theta}$, which are dual to the low-lying quark bilinear operators that correspond to states with $J^{PC} = 1^{--}, 1^{++}, 0^{-+}, 0^{++}$ -; see [7] for details. In the action of [8], the transverse scalars (namely η in the present case) are also present. We have discarded them when writing (2.3) since they do not have any interpretation in terms of QCD fields. Accordingly, even if the background (2.1) is six-dimensional, the holographic model for the hadrons is effectively five-dimensional and, in fact, its field content coincides with those of [5], [6]. For the tachyon potential we take, as the simplest possibility, the one computed in boundary string field theory for an unstable Dp-brane in flat space [12], although one should keep in mind that this expression for V is not top-down derived for the present situation. In the present conventions, $V = \mathcal{K} e^{-\frac{\pi}{2}\tau^2}$, where $\mathcal{K}$ is an overall constant that will play no role in the following since it does not enter the meson spectrum computation (it is important though, in the normalization of correlators when computing for instance decay constants [5], [6], [13]). The tachyon mass is $m_T^2 = -\frac{1}{2\alpha'}$ and we will impose: $R^2 = 6\alpha'$ in order to have $m_T^2 R^2 = -3$. This should not be interpreted as a modification of the background due to the branes, but just as a (bottom-up) choice of the string scale that controls the excitations of those branes, such that the bifundamental scalar T is dual to an operator of dimension 3, as in [5], [6]. Since the AdS radius is not parametrically larger than α' , the two-derivative action cannot be a controlled low energy approximation to string theory. This is the main reason why a model of this kind cannot be considered of top-down nature. Notice the value of R^2 we take differs from the one used in [10].

¹In five-dimensional holographic models of QCD, the flavor branes are expected to be a D4- $\bar{D}4$ system, [11].

The tachyon vacuum and chiral symmetry breaking

As shown in [7], an essential ingredient of the present framework is that the generation of the correct flavor anomaly on the flavor branes requires the tachyon modulus τ to diverge somewhere. Therefore, τ must have a nontrivial vev which breaks the chiral symmetry. From the action (2.2) we obtain the equation determining $\tau(z)$:

$$\tau'' - \frac{4\pi z f_\Lambda}{3} \tau'^3 + \left(-\frac{3}{z} + \frac{f'_\Lambda}{2f_\Lambda}\right) \tau' + \left(\frac{3}{z^2 f_\Lambda} + \pi \tau'^2\right) \tau = 0 \quad (2.4)$$

where the prime stands for derivative with respect to z . Near $z = 0$, the solution can be expanded in terms of two integration constants as:

$$\tau = c_1 z + \frac{\pi}{6} c_1^3 z^3 \log z + c_3 z^3 + \mathcal{O}(z^5) \quad (2.5)$$

where, on general AdS/CFT grounds, c_1 and c_3 are related to the quark mass and condensate (see [13] for a careful treatment). From (2.4), we find that τ can diverge only at $z = z_\Lambda$. There is a one-parameter family of diverging solutions in the IR:

$$\tau = \frac{C}{(z_\Lambda - z)^{\frac{3}{20}}} - \frac{13}{6\pi C} (z_\Lambda - z)^{\frac{3}{20}} + \dots \quad (2.6)$$

The interpretation is the following: for a given c_1 (namely quark mass²) fixed in the UV (near $z = 0$), the value of c_3 (namely the quark condensate) is determined dynamically by requiring that the numerical integration of (2.4) leads to the physical IR (near $z = z_\Lambda$) behavior (2.6). Hence, for any value³ of c_1 , one can obtain numerically the function for the vev $\langle \tau \rangle$.

Meson spectrum: Numerical results

There is a rather standard method for computing the meson spectrum in holographic models, see [1] for a review. Each bulk field is dual to a boundary operator and its linearized perturbation can be obtained after expanding (2.2). By looking at normalizable fluctuations of the bulk fields, one typically encounters discrete towers of masses for the physical states with the corresponding quantum numbers. Thus, for a fixed value of c_1 , we have a Sturm-Liouville problem for each bulk mode. This can be solved numerically, using a standard shooting technique. By computing the different towers at different values of c_1 , we found the following expressions to be very good approximations to the numerical results, in the range $0 < c_1 < 1$ where we could perform the numerics reliably. For the vectors:

$$\begin{aligned} z_\Lambda m_V^{(1)} &= 1.45 + 0.718c_1 & , & \quad z_\Lambda m_V^{(2)} = 2.64 + 0.594c_1 \\ z_\Lambda m_V^{(3)} &= 3.45 + 0.581c_1 & , & \quad z_\Lambda m_V^{(4)} = 4.13 + 0.578c_1 \\ z_\Lambda m_V^{(5)} &= 4.72 + 0.577c_1 & , & \quad z_\Lambda m_V^{(6)} = 5.25 + 0.576c_1. \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

²For the present work, we will just use that c_1 is proportional to m_q . Finding the proportionality coefficient requires normalizing the action and fields as in [14].

³In practice, we have been able to perform numerics in a controlled manner only for $0 \leq c_1 < 1$.

For the axial vectors:

$$\begin{aligned} z_\Lambda m_A^{(1)} &= 1.93 + 1.23c_1 \quad , \quad z_\Lambda m_A^{(2)} = 3.28 + 1.04c_1 \\ z_\Lambda m_A^{(3)} &= 4.29 + 0.997c_1 \quad , \quad z_\Lambda m_A^{(4)} = 5.13 + 0.975c_1 \\ z_\Lambda m_A^{(5)} &= 5.88 + 0.962c_1 \quad , \quad z_\Lambda m_A^{(6)} = 6.55 + 0.954c_1. \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

For the pseudoscalars:

$$\begin{aligned} z_\Lambda m_P^{(1)} &= \sqrt{2.47c_1^2 + 5.32c_1} \quad , \quad z_\Lambda m_P^{(2)} = 2.79 + 1.16c_1 \\ z_\Lambda m_P^{(3)} &= 3.87 + 1.08c_1 \quad , \quad z_\Lambda m_P^{(4)} = 4.77 + 1.04c_1 \\ z_\Lambda m_P^{(5)} &= 5.54 + 1.01c_1 \quad , \quad z_\Lambda m_P^{(6)} = 6.24 + 0.997c_1. \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

For the scalars:

$$\begin{aligned} z_\Lambda m_S^{(1)} &= 2.47 + 0.683c_1 \quad , \quad z_\Lambda m_S^{(2)} = 3.73 + 0.488c_1 \\ z_\Lambda m_S^{(3)} &= 4.41 + 0.507c_1 \quad , \quad z_\Lambda m_S^{(4)} = 4.99 + 0.519c_1 \\ z_\Lambda m_S^{(5)} &= 5.50 + 0.536c_1 \quad , \quad z_\Lambda m_S^{(6)} = 5.98 + 0.543c_1. \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

It turns out that meson masses increase linearly with c_1 . Namely, they increase linearly with the bare quark mass, as expected from an expansion in m_q and in qualitative agreement with lattice results, see for instance [15],[16],[17]. The exception, of course, is the first pseudoscalar for which m_π is proportional to $\sqrt{m_q}$ (for small m_q), as expected from the Gell-Mann-Oakes-Renner relation. Actually, the behaviour $m_\pi = \sqrt{b m_q + d m_q^2}$ was also found in the lattice [15].

3. Fitting the meson spectrum

We now proceed to make a phenomenological comparison of the results of (2.7)-(2.10) to the experimental values quoted by the Particle Data Group [18]. Obviously, we can only model those mesons with $J^{PC} = 1^{--}, 1^{++}, 0^{-+}, 0^{++}$. From [18], we will just take the central value quoted for each resonance. We do not discuss decay widths here (in the strict $N_c \rightarrow \infty$ limit they are of course zero).

Isospin 1 mesons

We start by looking at mesons composed of the light quarks u and d . In particular, we discuss the isovectors. In table 1, we show all the mesons listed in the meson summary table of [18] under *light unflavored mesons* which have isospin 1 and the J^{PC} 's present in our model. The only exception is $a_0(980)$, which is considered to be a four-quark state [18]. We have fitted the parameters of the model to these observables by minimizing the rms error $\varepsilon_{rms} = 100 \times \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\sum_O \left(\frac{\delta O}{O} \right)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, where $n = 8 - 2 = 6$ is the number of observables minus the number of parameters. We obtain for the parameters

$$z_\Lambda^{-1} = 522 \text{ MeV} \quad , \quad c_{1,1} = 0.0125 \quad (3.1)$$

J^{PC}	Meson	Measured (MeV)	Model (MeV)
1^{--}	$\rho(770)$	775	762
	$\rho(1450)$	1465	1379
	$\rho(1700)$	1720	1806
1^{++}	$a_1(1260)$	1230	1015
0^{-+}	π_0	135.0	135.1
	$\pi(1300)$	1300	1462
	$\pi(1800)$	1816	2026
0^{++}	$a_0(1450)$	1474	1295

Table 1: A comparison of the results of the model to the experimental values for light unflavored meson masses.

with $\varepsilon_{rms} = 12\%$.

In table 2, we display the resonance masses with isospin 1 listed in [18] under *other light unflavored mesons*. These are namely states considered as “poorly established that thus require confirmation”. For the results given by our model, we use (3.1) and therefore no further parameter is fitted here. For this set of observables we get $\varepsilon_{rms} = 24\%$, where we have inserted $n = 11 - 0 = 8$. One should keep in mind that it is plausible that some of these “unconfirmed” states may not be real or may be misinterpreted as part of the meson towers. In this sense, our model seems to favor the $\rho(2150)$ as the fourth member of the ρ -meson tower⁴. We have not included $\rho(1570)$ in table 2 because its excitation number is smaller than $\rho(1700)$, which was included in the previous fit. In case $\rho(1570)$ gets confirmed as a member of this tower, the fit should be redone. We observe that the model tends to consistently overestimate the masses of the excited axial vectors and pions. This is connected to the fact the model yields a Regge slope for axial mesons larger than the one for the vectors [7]. If the experimental results of table 2 are confirmed, one should think of improving the model in order to ameliorate this discrepancy.

$s\bar{s}$ states

A nice feature of the present model is that it incorporates the dependence of the hadron masses on the quark mass. This allows us to study $s\bar{s}$ states. More precisely, it allows us to discuss “hypothetical states” with quark content $s\bar{s}$ assuming no mixing with other states. In the real world, the mixing for pseudoscalars and scalars is important (see chapter 14 of [18]), and therefore it is not possible to compare directly the outcome of the model to the experimental results. Nevertheless, as in [19], we can estimate the masses of these “hypothetical” $s\bar{s}$ mesons from the light-strange and light-light mesons. Then, using quotation marks for the hypothetical states, and using the quark model classification (table 14.2 of [18]) we can write $m(\text{“}\eta\text{”}) = \sqrt{2m_K^2 - m_\pi^2}$, $m(\text{“}\phi(1020)\text{”}) = 2m(K^*(892)) - m(\rho(770))$, $m(\text{“}\eta(1475)\text{”}) = 2m(K(1460)) - m(\pi(1300))$, etc. Keeping the value of z_Λ found in (3.1),

⁴Indeed, there is much more experimental evidence for $\rho(2150)$ than for $\rho(1900)$ or $\rho(1570)$. We thank S. Eydelman for very useful explanations.

J^{PC}	Meson	Measured (MeV)	Model (MeV)
1^{--}	$\rho(1900)$	1900	2159
	$\rho(2150)$	2150	2467
	$\rho(2270)$	2270	2746
1^{++}	$a_1(1640)$	1647	1721
	$a_1(1930)$	1930	2245
	$a_1(2096)$	2096	2686
	$a_1(2270)$	2270	3073
	$a_1(2340)$	2340	3423
0^{-+}	$\pi(2070)$	2070	2493
	$\pi(2360)$	2360	2899
0^{++}	$a_0(2020)$	2025	1952

Table 2: A comparison of the results of the model to the experimental values for other light unflavored meson masses.

we fit the value of c_1 associated with the strange quark to the “experimental” values of table 3, obtaining.

$$c_{1,s} = 0.317 \quad (3.2)$$

The rms error for this set of observables ($n = 6 - 1$) is $\varepsilon_{rms} = 10\%$.

J^{PC}	Meson	Measured (MeV)	Model (MeV)
1^{--}	“ $\phi(1020)$ ”	1009	876
	“ $\phi(1680)$ ”	1363	1474
1^{++}	“ $f_1(1420)$ ”	1440	1210
0^{-+}	“ η ”	691	725
	“ $\eta(1475)$ ”	1620	1647
0^{++}	“ $f_0(1710)$ ”	1386	1403

Table 3: A comparison of the results of the model to the hypothetical states with $s\bar{s}$ quark content.

Further comments

We end this section by commenting on the estimates given by the model on two other physical quantities. Without fixing the proportionality coefficient between c_1 and the quark mass, from (3.1), (3.2), we can infer the ratio of the strange quark to the light quark mass: $\frac{2m_s}{m_u+m_d} \approx \frac{c_{1,s}}{c_{1,l}} \approx 25$. Moreover, the background studied here experiences a first order deconfinement phase transition in full analogy with [9]. The deconfinement temperature is given by $T_{deconf} = \frac{5}{4\pi z_\Lambda} \approx 208$ MeV. Both of these values are close to the experimental values.

4. Conclusions

We have built a new phenomenological model for the meson sector of QCD. In this paper we have discussed the mass spectrum. We note the simplicity of the construction, whose essential point is the use of Sen's action [8] including the open string tachyon field. We have applied it to one of the simplest backgrounds exhibiting confinement [10]. Despite the minimal input, we have found the following interesting qualitative properties:

- The model includes towers of excitations with $J^{PC} = 1^{--}, 1^{++}, 0^{-+}, 0^{++}$, namely all low-lying operators that do not need a dual excited stringy state.
- Chiral symmetry breaking is consistently realized. Moreover, the value of the quark condensate is computed dynamically and is not a tunable input. Hence, the number of tunable parameters coincides with those present in QCD: they are just the dynamically generated scale and the quark masses.
- We find Regge trajectories for the excited states $m_n^2 \propto n$, as in the soft wall model [20]. This allows good predictions for the higher excitations, as opposed to the hard wall model [5, 6]. Notwithstanding, the Regge slope for axial vectors is bigger than the one for vectors. This fact requires further study.
- Our model incorporates the increase of the vector meson masses due to the increase of quark masses, as $m_\rho \approx k_1 + k_2 m_\pi^2$ for small m_π .

Previous AdS/QCD models present some of these properties, but as far as we know, no existing model is able to encompass all of them, see [21] for recent related discussions. We briefly comment on the three benchmark models: the Sakai-Sugimoto model [3] misses the first and third points listed above, the hard wall model [5, 6] misses the third one and partially the second one; and the soft wall model [20] misses the second one. All of these models [3, 5, 6, 20] and variations thereof fail to get the fourth point (although it is worth mentioning that D3D7 models with abelian flavor symmetry do capture the physics of this fourth point, see section 6.2.3 of [1]).

Moreover, the quantitative matching shown in tables 1 and 3 with the central values of the meson resonances is excellent, at the 10%-15% level. This is a typical accuracy of AdS-QCD-like models (a recent example is [22], which accounts for excited spin states of the ρ and ω families). Since the systematic error produced by quenching is of the order of 10% [23] and the differences between quenched lattice computations with $N_c = 3$ and $N_c = \infty$ are again of the order of 10% [16, 17], it would be unexpected to get a better accuracy from any model of the kind presented here.

It would be of utmost interest to generalize the set-up to the non-abelian case, allowing several quark flavors, but this is beyond the scope of the present work.

Acknowledgments

This work was partially supported by a European Union grant FP7-REGPOT-2008-1-CreteHEP Cosmo-228644. The research of A.P is supported by grants FPA2007-66665C02-

02 and DURSI 2009 SGR 168, and by the CPAN CSD2007-00042 project of the Consolider-Ingenio 2010 program. I.I. has been supported by Manasaki Graduate Scholarship and the Physics department of the University of Crete until September 2009 and by A.S. Onassis Foundation Graduate Scholarship from October 2009.

References

- [1] J. Erdmenger, N. Evans, I. Kirsch and E. Threlfall, *Eur. Phys. J. A* **35**, 81 (2008).
- [2] I. R. Klebanov and M. J. Strassler, *JHEP* **0008**, 052 (2000). J. Babington, J. Erdmenger, N. J. Evans, Z. Guralnik and I. Kirsch, *Phys. Rev. D* **69**, 066007 (2004). M. Kruczenski, D. Mateos, R. C. Myers and D. J. Winters, *JHEP* **0405**, 041 (2004).
- [3] T. Sakai and S. Sugimoto, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **113** (2005) 843.
- [4] J. Polchinski and M. J. Strassler, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 031601 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0109174].
- [5] J. Erlich, E. Katz, D. T. Son and M. A. Stephanov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 261602 (2005).
- [6] L. Da Rold and A. Pomarol, *Nucl. Phys. B* **721**, 79 (2005).
- [7] R. Casero, E. Kiritsis and A. Paredes, *Nucl. Phys. B* **787**, 98 (2007).
- [8] A. Sen, *Phys. Rev. D* **68**, 066008 (2003).
- [9] E. Witten, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **2**, 505 (1998).
- [10] S. Kuperstein and J. Sonnenschein, *JHEP* **0411**, 026 (2004).
- [11] F. Bigazzi, R. Casero, A. L. Cotrone, E. Kiritsis and A. Paredes, *JHEP* **0510**, 012 (2005); U. Gursoy and E. Kiritsis, *JHEP* **0802** (2008) 032; U. Gursoy, E. Kiritsis and F. Nitti, *JHEP* **0802** (2008) 019; U. Gursoy, E. Kiritsis, L. Mazzanti and F. Nitti, *JHEP* **0905** (2009) 033.
- [12] D. Kutasov, M. Marino and G. W. Moore, *JHEP* **0010** (2000) 045.
- [13] I. Iatrakis, E. Kiritsis and A. Paredes, *in preparation*
- [14] L. Da Rold and A. Pomarol, *JHEP* **0601**, 157 (2006).
- [15] E. Laermann and P. Schmidt, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **20**, 541 (2001).
- [16] L. Del Debbio, B. Lucini, A. Patella and C. Pica, *JHEP* **0803**, 062 (2008).
- [17] G. S. Bali and F. Bursa, *JHEP* **0809**, 110 (2008).
- [18] C. Amsler *et al.* [Particle Data Group], *Phys. Lett. B* **667**, 1 (2008).
- [19] C. R. Allton, V. Gimenez, L. Giusti and F. Rapuano, *Nucl. Phys. B* **489**, 427 (1997).
- [20] A. Karch, E. Katz, D. T. Son and M. A. Stephanov, *Phys. Rev. D* **74**, 015005 (2006).
- [21] T. Gherghetta, J. I. Kapusta and T. M. Kelley, *Phys. Rev. D* **79**, 076003 (2009); Y. Q. Sui, Y. L. Wu, Z. F. Xie and Y. B. Yang, *Phys. Rev. D* **81**, 014024 (2010).
- [22] G. F. de Teramond and S. J. Brodsky, arXiv:1001.5193 [hep-ph].
- [23] S. Aoki *et al.* [CP-PACS Collaboration], *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 238 (2000).